



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,601	08/30/2001	Tetsuyuki Muto	44471-263225(13700)	1962

23370 7590 02/02/2005

JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP
1100 PEACHTREE STREET
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,601

Applicant(s)

MUTO ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13,16-25,28-32 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13,16-25,28-32 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01262005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment, filed 10/29/2004.
2. Claims 1, 4-13, 16-25, 28-32 and 35-38 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 25 and 32 are independent claims. In the amendment, claims 2, 3, 14, 15, 26, 27, 33 and 34 are canceled, claims 1, 13, 25 and 32 are amended, and no claim is added. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 35, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter (US 6,570,595) in view of Miller (US 6,229,542).

As independent claim 1, Porter teaches a computer method and corresponding system and for posting advertisements, comprising the steps/means:

(a) displaying multiple Web pages on a display screen of a comprehensive information viewing device (fig. 6; col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 5) capable of smoothly enlarging or contracting each Web page at arbitrary magnification rate (it is inherent that the browsers in the display area 604 of fig. 6 can be adjusted to be smaller or larger), arbitrarily varying and

Art Unit: 2179

controlling transparency levels of the multiple Web pages that are arranged in superposition such that any overlapped hidden portion can be made visible (col. 8, lines 1-5).

Porter does not disclose smoothly rotating each Web page at an arbitrary angle, and three-dimensionally arranging the multiple Web pages such that the multiple Web pages can be viewed from an arbitrary angle; Miller discloses rotating each window in a three dimensional space at arbitrary angle (col. 3, lines 11-16) and three-dimensionally arranging the multiple windows such that the multiple windows can be viewed from arbitrary angle (fig. 4 and fig. 5; col. 3, line 53 – col. 4, line 14). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Miller of rotating each window in a three dimensional space at arbitrary angle and three-dimensionally arranging the multiple windows such that the multiple windows can be viewed from arbitrary angle in Porter's Web pages system since it would provide depth dimension that addresses the web page overcrowding problem by allowing web pages to be positioned and arranged within a true three dimensional space.

(b) Porter further teaches displaying advertisements each of which relates to attribute information of one of the Web pages on the display screen of the comprehensive information viewing device at arbitrary sizes and transparency levels in relation to the multiple Web pages displayed by the step (a) (fig. 6; col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 5), wherein each of the advertisements is displayed in a vicinity of one of the Web pages, wherein the attribute information of the one of the Web pages is related to attribute information of the advertisement (fig. 5 and fig. 6; col. 7, line 52 – col. 8, line 5 and col. 8, lines 28-46). Miller as combined to Porter provides the ability to view displaying advertisements at arbitrary angles in relation to the multiple Web pages displayed by the step (a) (fig. 4 and fig. 5; col. 3, line 53 – col. 4, line 14).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter teaches:

(c) displaying overlay information in superposition to the multiple Web pages displayed by the step (a) (by switching between the corresponding iconic representations of the Web pages; col. 8, lines 1-5), wherein the step (b) displays the advertisements in relation to the overlay information (fig. 6, col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 5).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, modified Porter teaches determining a position for displaying each advertisement according to a user attribute information contained in the overlay information displayed on the display screen (Miller, col. 6, lines 7-9).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter teaches searching the multiple Web pages to be displayed by the step (a) according to a user input at the comprehensive information viewing device (fig. 6, col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 5 and col. 8, lines 28-33).

As per claims 13, 25, and 32, they are similar in scope to claim 1; therefore, they should be rejected under the same rationale.

As per claims 16, 28, and 35, they are similar in scope to claim 4; therefore, they should be rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2179

As per claims 18, 30, and 37, they are similar in scope to claim 6; therefore, they should be rejected under the same rationale.

As per claims 19, 31, and 38, they are similar in scope to claim 7; therefore, they should be rejected under the same rationale.

5. Claims 5, 17, 29, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Miller.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, modified Porter does not disclose the step (c) displays the overlay information in animation, and the step (b) displays the advertisements in animation. The Examiner takes Official Notice that advertisements displayed in animation is well known in the computer Web/Internet art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to have the advertisements displayed in animation in modified Porter's system since it would attract attentions of viewers.

As per claims 17, 29, and 36, they are similar in scope to claim 5; therefore, they should be rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 8-10, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Miller and further in view of Shaffer et al. ("Shaffer", US 6,748,426).

As per claims 8 and 9, Porter teaches obtaining advertising information of the multiple Web pages to be displayed by the step (a) at plurality of Web page image formation devices and

Art Unit: 2179

providing the Web page information to the comprehensive information viewing device in response to Web page information requests from the comprehensive information viewing device, wherein the Web page image formation devices are provided on a network to which the comprehensive information viewing device is connected, wherein at the obtaining step, the Web page formation devices obtain the information requested by the comprehensive information viewing device by acquiring data of the multiple Web page from Web servers and carrying out image formation processing for the multiple Web pages, by using existing Web browsers respectively provided in the Web page formation devices. (fig. 6, col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 5 and col. 8, lines 14-54). However, modified Porter does not disclose the Web page information including images. Shaffer discloses that in col. 15, lines 5-9. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Shaffer's Web page images in modified Porter's advertising information since it would create interests in the viewers.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, Porter teaches each Web page image formation devices has a Web page image storing unit for storing existing images of some Web pages in advance, and obtains each image by reading out the existing image stored in the Web page image storing unit when an image of a Web page requested from the comprehensive information viewing device is stored in the Web page image storing unit (col. 15, lines 1-26).

As per claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2179

As per claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 22, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Miller and Shaffer and further in view of Roberts et al. ("Roberts", US 6,754,693).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 8, modified Porter does not disclose the plurality of Web page image formation devices share a common Web page image storing unit for storing existing images of some Web pages in advance which is provided on a network to which the plurality of Web page image formation devices are connected, and obtain each image by reading out the existing image stored in the common Web page image, storing unit when an image of a Web page requested from the comprehensive information viewing device is stored in the common Web page image storing unit. Roberts discloses Web browsers can request shared contents, which include application images, in a shared storage at col. 12, lines 12-16. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Roberts of the shared web page image-storing unit in modified Porter's system since it would allow the system to save the storage space.

As per claim 23, it is a similar scope to claim 11; therefore, it should be rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2179

8. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Miller and Shaffer and further in view of Yu (US 6,351,775).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 8, modified Porter does not disclose distributing the Web page image requests from the comprehensive information viewing device among the plurality of Web page image formation devices according to a loaded state of each Web page image formation device, at a load balancing server provided between the comprehensive information viewing device and the plurality of Web page image formation devices. Yu discloses that at col. 12, lines 18-48. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Yu of load balancing server to balance the Web page image requests in modified Porter's system since it would allow the system to retrieve web data faster.

As per claim 24, it is a similar scope to claim 12; therefore, it should be rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

Neither Porter nor Miller discloses displaying advertisements that are related to attribute information of a web page in a vicinity of the web page.

Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

According to Porter, fig. 6 discloses one example of advertisements shown in form of iconic representation displayed in exclusive-use display areas (EDA). Fig. 5, on the other hand, is another example of advertisements that are displayed in a vicinity of the web page (fig. 5, col. 7, lines 38-61; web page area 504 and advertisement areas 506b and 506c). Depending on requests of attribute information from the web page area 504, the server transmits a web page that includes a script that requests EDA manager 310 to provide an URL identifying program assigned to a designated EDA for advertisements (col. 8, lines 28-46). Therefore, Porter clearly teaches displaying advertisements that are related to attribute information of a web page in a vicinity of the web page.

Conclusion

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2179

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703)308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
July 21, 2004

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER